Hon'ble P.C.Verma, J.

Heard Sri Ramji Srivastava learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P.S. Adhikari learned counsel for the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was performing functions of the Peon which was done by the earlier Peon who has been promoted against the vacancy and against the vacancy created by the earlier Peon, the petitioner was appointed and he was working according to the order dated 03.03.2003, therefore the suspension order may be revoked.

The petitioner was suspended by the order dated 22.03.2003 on the ground that he declined to work according to order dated 03.03.2003. Since, now the petitioner is ready to work, therefore the Authority is directed to revoke the suspension order and allow the petitioner to work. The payment relating to suspension allowance shall be decided according to Rules. However, it is clarified that the petitioner shall work except the work of sweeper. He will perform all the work assigned to 'Farrash' and Cleaner.

With the aforesaid observation the writ petition is finally disposed of.

29.09.2003:
NCM:

(P.C. Verma, J.)